

700 C 22
3

A
TRUE COPY
OF A
LETTER

Lately Written by
Mr. DOWLET

TO

Dr. WELLS,

And now published by Dr. WELLS,

Together with the

Doctor's ANSWER.

The Second Edition.

Imprimatur,

GUIL. DELAUNE

Vice-Chan. OXON.

Apr. 10. 1706.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATER for *Jo. Stephens*, and are
to be sold by *James Knapton* at the Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, London. 1706.

A
TRUE COPY
OF A
LETTER

Lately Written by
Mr. DOWLEY
TO
Dr. WELLS

And now published by Dr. WELLS
Together with the
Doctor's ANSWER.

The Second Edition.

Printed at
GUIL. DE LAUNE
Vice-Chan. OXON.

OXFORD,
Printed at the THEATRE for J. Streater, and are
to be sold by James Knapton at the Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, London. 1706.

To Mr. PETER DOWLEY.

SIR,

HAD the Letter you lately writ and sent to Me, related only to *My Self*, how Ill soever you have dealt with me therein, yet it should for my part have never seen any other Light, than that of the Fire. But since your Letter is of *Publick Concern*, and relates not only to *My Self*, but to the *Controversy* between Us; and since you and your Followers have with great Industry and Assurance given out, that it contained a *Full Answer to my Two Printed Letters*; I leave it to the World to judge, whether I am not under an *Indispensable Obligation* of *Publishing* your Letter, that so I may *prove the Falseness* of the Rumour spread abroad, by you and your Party, and *Vindicate the Goodness* of the Cause I am Engaged in.

I can assure you, Sir, that I have been most strictly careful, that no Injustice should be done you by *Transcribing* your Letter, insomuch that I have not suffer'd a *single Letter or Comma* to be *Altered*. And I have also desired, that the like Special Care might be taken by the *Printer*.

Before I come to the Consideration of your Letter, I cannot but here Observe to you, how pregnant and lively an Instance is afforded by you and your Followers of the strange and deplorable *Obstinacy of Willfull Prejudice*.

I cannot but in Charity think that *some of your Followers* will be so Just to Me, as to Bear me Witness, that upon Applying my Self to them in order to Convince them of the *Sinfullness* of their Separation, they with a seeming Modesty Excused themselves from Arguing thoroughly the Matter with me, adding that I would Do well to propose what I had to say to Mr. Dowley, and that they should very much Like to have

have the Points in Controversy Fairly Debated between Us Two for their Satisfaction. Hereupon I drew up my Two Letters since Published; for though I knew there were Already extant many Excellent Discourses or Books on such Subjects, yet I knew of No one that was Suitable either to my Own Circumstances for to Purchase and Distribute, or to the Circumstances of my Dissenting Parishioners to Peruse and Read.

Now as I had thus Not refused to take (no inconsiderable) Pains at the Motion, and for the Satisfaction, of your Followers aforesaid; So I did indeed Expect, and I think not without good Reason, that you likewise should have been Moved and Prevailed with by the same your Followers, Not to refuse to take the like Pains for their Satisfaction, namely by Putting into their Hands a Direct and Particular Answer of your Own to All the several Points made out in my Letters Against your and their Principles and Practices.

I leave the World to judge, whether This be Any other, than what your Followers above specified stand in Honour Engaged to Press and Prevail on you to Do; or whether else They have not Good Reason to suspect that their Cause is Very Bad, since you their Leader are Afraid to Appear Publickly in It's Behalf; and therefore whether They have not Good Reason to Quit and Renounce both It and You. Is it not then most Strange, and no other way to be Accounted for but by the Badness of your Cause, and the unreasonable Obstinacy and Blindness of Prejudice, that you, Sir, for your part should Content your Self to Do no more than Send me a Written Letter together with De Laune's Plea for the Non-conformists; and your Followers on their part should presently be Converted (without so much as the Sight or Reading of your Letter, and only) with a bare implicit (and so Popish) Belief of your Letter's containing a Satisfactory Answer to my Printed Letters?

That nothing may be wanting in me to Convince you and your Followers of such (your and their) unwarrantable Prejudice and Partiality, I shall consider Each Case distinctly; and out of Respect to you, Sir, I shall give your Case the First place.

Your

To Mr. Peter Dowley.

5

Your Letter then may (as will appear hereafter) be distinguished into Three General parts, viz. *Bare Confident Assertions* intermixt with *Uncivil Language*; *Sham* or downright *False Reasons* for your *Not Appearing* in Print; and *Hints* (as you call them) of What Feats you Could Atchieve, were you but pleased to be in the *Mind*.

Whether I have not Abundantly Proved below, that your *Reasons* are no other than mere *Pretexts* or *Downright Falsities*; and that the *Hints* you have given, expose (*not Mine, but*) your *Own Nakedness*; let the impartial and judicious Reader determine. As for the other general Part of your Letter, I am very well content to be *altogether Ouidone* by you, viz. both as to *Bare Confidence of Assertion*, and also as to *Incivility of Language or Treatments*. Thus much for your *Own Letter* here in general.

As for *De Laune's Plea* &c. sent with your Letter, I make you this very fair Offer, that if you shall think fit to put forth any Treatise by way of *Proof* (of what you pretend, viz.) that the said *Plea* is a full Answer to my Letters, then I will hereby publicly engage my self (by God's Blessing) to show that you are very much mistaken, and that *De Laune's Plea* (though somewhat Bulky in Volume, yet is very Scanty as to sound Arguments, and) doth not disprove Any One Point asserted in my Letters. And the same Offer that I here make you in reference to *De Laune's Plea*, I make you likewise in reference to the other Books (referred to in your Letter, viz.) of Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Alsop, &c. And this is all you or your Followers can in Reason possibly expect of me, till you make the way for my actually performing what I here engage: for I am now only to attend your *Motions*.

Lastly, supposing Any of the Books aforementioned did contain a full Answer to my Letters, yet are you, Sir, assured that your Followers have (or have you given your self the trouble to take care that they should have) it for to read and give them Satisfaction? Moreover, are you not perswaded, that what is said more largely in any of the aforesaid Books, might be brought into narrower Compass, and also might some other ways be render'd more suitable to the Circumstances

of your Followers? And therefore how can you acquit your self from taking (on such an Occasion) a *little more than ordinary Pains* for the *Greater Benefit* of your Party? Do you hereby approve your self to be a *Labourer in the Vineyard*? And now I have mention'd this Comparison of the Church to a *Vineyard*, it brings to my mind what seems to be the most natural, and so best Account of your being *so sparing of your Labour*. For you well know, that though there is need of a *great deal of pains* to dress and keep *Vines* in due order, so as to Bring forth *Good Fruit*; and not in time to *Degenerate* so far as to Bring forth *Wild Grapes*: yet on the other hand *Briers* and *Thorns* require *no such Care* to make them thrive, or to keep them from *Turning or Altering* so as to bear *Good Fruit*.

From what has been said, may appear the Strength of your own *Prejudice*, and Greatness of your own *Partiality*, in *Refusing* to give my Letters their *due Consideration*, and in *Contenting* your self with what you have done, and is already mention'd. I now proceed to the Case of your Followers, and to lay open the *Obstinate Prejudice* and *Partiality*, whereby they are carried away from *Rightly* Considering what I have offer'd to them in my Printed Letters, and are *Forced* at least to make shew of their being fully *Contented* and *Satisfied* even with your doing nothing for their Satisfaction.

I desire then of your Followers only to give me a *Direct* and *Sincere Answer* (as before God) to this Question, "Whether, supposing upon the Motion of any of them you had *Publickly* propos'd to me your *Objections* against our *Communion*, and I had declined *Returning* you a *Publick Answer*, they *would not presently have run away with full cry* that (whatever *I might Pretend*, the only *True Reason*, why *I did not*, *was because*) *I Could not*, or was *Afraid to*, *Answer* you *Publickly*? But now 'tis evident to the meanest Capacity, that for Persons to think *Well* of the *very same thing* in *One man*, which they would think *Ill* of in *Another man*, can be the Effect only of *unreasonable*, and therefore *unjustifiable Prejudice* and *Partiality*.

And as the Behaviour of the Generality of your Party is thus *Highly Blameable*, so this sort of Behaviour in them

who

To Mr. Peter Dowley.

7

who moved me to Do what I have Done, is further Aggravated, as being Accusable of Insincerity as well as Prejudice and Partiality. For, whatever specious Shew they made to me of being Willing to have Matters in Debate fairly Discussed, 'tis now apparent, that all the while they meant no other than what some of your Party have not been Ashamed to Declare Openly to this effect, viz. that Let me Write what I would, they were Resolved to Continue as they Are. However God forbid that I should cease to Pray for and Endeavour their Repentance and Amendment. And so I come to the Consideration of the Letter you, Sir, were pleased to write to me, which I shall consider (for the Reader's Ease) Paragraph by Paragraph.

LETTER

TO

DR. WELLS

Together with the Doctor's Answer

MR. DOWLEY'S LETTER

REVEREND SIR

I received your letter from your son, and was surprised to find of your own party, &c. the letter was intended to me, the name of your son (writing such things to me) of whom you had no knowledge (the only in common name) I could not otherwise have known, but that either you are so conversant of your performance, that you think all the letters which reach the printer's hands, are contained in the list of your papers, or else that you mean to write by way of answer to the list of your letters:

A True
That I have no other knowledge of you, Sir, but by common Name (or what I have heard from others; more especially

A True Copy
OF
Mr. DOWLEY'S
LETTER
TO

Dr. WELLS,

Together with the Doctor's ANSWER.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

REVd. SIR

I Received 2 : printed letters from you, the one directed to some of your own parish, & the other particularly to me, the meaning of your sending such things to me (of whom you have no knowledge but only by common fame) I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited of your performance, that you think all the dissenters must needs be thunder struck, fall down convinced at the sight of your papers, or else that you would intrude me to write by way of answer to the subject of your letters :

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

That I have no other knowledge of you, Sir, but by common Fame (or what I have heard from Others, more especially
your

Mr. Dowley's Letter &c.

9

your own Followers,) I readily allow: and surely you must allow, that this is Ground Enough and Enough to Know you to be a Dissenting Teacher, and Him whom my Dissenting Parishioners follow; and therefore Ground Enough to Send you Such Things as my own printed Letters. Pray what things could you reasonably expect I should Send you, but Such Things? Indeed I understand by Common Fame, that the more Affectionate of your Party frequently send you Other Things, which I easily imagine agree much better with your Stomach and Constitution, than What I sent. For 'tis pretty manifest from your own Letter, that what I sent did not digest well, but put you Out of order, and Into a kind of Fever: which is the Best Excuse that can be made for your Uncharitable Interpretation of the Meaning of my sending my Two Letters to you.

For your words are [the meaning of your sending such things to me I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited of your Performance &c.] Now had you, Sir, but a very small portion of the Charity so much talked of by your Party, you would have been induced thereby to have otherwise interpreted the Meaning of my sending such things to you, and to have had some more candid Regard to my Solemn Declarations, that I had never troubled you or my Parishioners with my printed Letters, but in order (to do what in me lay) to undeceive you and them as to your sinfull Errors and Practices.

In short, Sir, I leave you or the most quick-sighted of your Followers to find out in Either of my Letters One such downright unmannerly Personal Reflection, as you are pleased out of your sort of Charity and Moderation to bestow upon me, viz. Being Contented with my Own Performance. That you was a Non-Conformist to the Rules of Church-Decency, I knew indeed afore by Common Fame; but I confess I did not know, till I learnt so much from your own Letter, that you was likewise a Non-Conformist to the Rules of Common Civility and Good Manners.

Well, but in what degree do you suppose me to be Con-
cious of my Own Performance? Why, so as to think All the
Dissenters must needs be Thunder-struck, and fall down Convinced

at the Sight of my Papers. Truly, Sir, was my Concern like this your Expression, it would be very High and Affecting. Pray don't your Sermons usually run in this strain of Eloquence? And may it not be well supposed, that 'tis on account of such your Mighty and Thunder-striking Expressions, that your Hearers by virtue of their Unquestionable Judgement have Dubbed you with the admired Title of a Powerfull Teacher?

As to the Dissenters being Thunder-struck, I heartily wish they did not give so Just occasion to think that they are so, at least as the Word is sometimes used to denote, viz. Being Deprived of Right Reason and Understanding.

And as to the Dissenters Falling down Convinced at the Sight of my Papers, you have unawares given an Intimation, that you well understand how they are wont to be Convinced, viz. by Shew and Appearance, not by Reason and Argument. Indeed I wish I had not Cause to Fear, that Some of them, if ever they are Convinced, must be so only at the Sight of my Papers; forasmuch as they are so carried away with Prejudice, as Not to Afford my Papers the Reading, as they ought in Conscience.

I shall now leave the World to judge, whether you are not a very Bad and Uncharitable Interpreter hitherto; and so proceed to your other Interpretation, that I would Invite you to Write by way of Answer to the Subject of my Letters. Sir, however you please to Deal with me, I shall be very carefull to do you Justice; and therefore freely own, that you are in the Right as to This Interpretation; as much as you were in the Wrong as to the Other. And I leave it to the Judgment of the Reader, whether you have alledged any tolerable Reason for Not Writing and Publishing an Answer. Let us see then what follows in your Letter.

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

As to the former, I must truly say I meet with no conviction from them; but rather much confirmation in my judgement & practice; when I see such a Mr. & Dr. of the Church coming forth in the defence of it, with so much ignorance weakness & mistake, it establishes

With Dr. Wells's Answer.

11

establishes me that the truth is on our side, when one of such degree in the University has so little of moment to say against us.

Dr. WELL'S'S Answer.

As to your meeting with no Conviction &c. from my Letters, 'tis most Proper to refer it to the Determination of Impartial Judges, whether the True Cause thereof is to be ascribed to the *Weakness of my Arguments*, or to the *Strength of your Prejudice*.

I shall therefore only observe, that, had there been (in the Few Lines of your Letter immediately foregoing) as much *Proof of what you lay to my Charge*, as there is *Course*, if not *Ill Language*; I am sure I ought to have *Blush'd*. But since there is only very *Course*, not to say *Ill Language*, and *No Proof*; pray consider whether you ought not to *Blush*.

If my *Ignorance, Weakness, and Mistake* be so *Great* as you would have it thought, 'tis the more *Easy* for you to *Expose and Shew It*: and if I have said so *Little of Moment* against you, 'tis the sooner *Answered*. And therefore why will you let slip the *Opportunity of a Publick Victory and Triumph*? I dare say, and Others will be apt to think, that such your *Conduct* is not owing to *Any Kindness to Me*.

You would do well to call to mind, that an Army, which keeps close within it's Entrenchments, and refuses to joyn Battle in the *Open Field*, when 'tis fairly offer'd by the *Opposite Side*, is with very *Good Reason* counted to be the *Weakest in Reality*, how much soever it may *Decry the Enemy's Strength*, and *Boast of it's Own*, or whatever *Pretences* it may give out for so Acting. Whatever you please to think of my *Ignorance*, I will however be so *Civil* to you, Sir, as to suppose, that your *Ignorance* is not so *Great*, but that you know how to make the *Application to your self*: and therefore I shall go on to Consider the *Reasons* urged by you for your not *Publishing* an Answer to my Letters.

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

And as to the other, many reasons withhold me from writing publicly at this time, the *Queen's* most excellent majesty hath so often signified from the throne her desire that all her subjects should love in love

Mr. Dowley's Letter,

love & peace, that I shall not lightly take up the bone of contention, persons should shew more manners to the government they live under, then to scatter strife when the royal authority calls them to unity & concord.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Since you say, Sir, that *Many Reasons* with-hold you &c. and are pleased to mention but three or four, which are very far from being *Good ones*; it may be well infer'd, that the Others must be *Extremely Bad ones*, and therefore you acted prudently in keeping them to your self. Besides, why do you intimate, that you are with-holden from Writing Publickly *at This time* more than you may be *at Any time* hereafter as long as you or I can probably expect to live?

Her most Excellent Majesty, as She hath Often signified Already, so I heartily pray God that She may Live Often Again to Signify from the Throne Her most highly Commendable Desire that *All her Subjects* should live in Love and Peace, Unity and Concord. And sure I am that the Only Design of my Letters was to Promote Love and Peace, Unity and Concord, by Endeavouring what I could to Remove the Chief Occasion of our Unhappy Discords. If my Letters have a Contrary Effect on you, the Fault is only yours; if you cannot return an Answer without an Unchristian Contemion, or with the like Meekness and Calmness as my Letters were written with, 'tis the Unhappiness of your Temper. But pray had it not been more for your Credit, to have Concealed this your Unhappiness of Temper, than to have thus Discovered, that 'tis impossible for you to Answer, without Snarling like a Dog about a Bone?

As to the *Admonition* you take upon you to give, I know No One in All these Parts that stands in need of it, but only your self; and therefore be pleased to Do as Well as Say, and to Practise as one that knows that Persons should shew more Manners to the Government they live under, than to Propagate and Scatter Strife, and keep up Unnecessary and Sinfull Divisions by their Separate Congregations, when the Royal Authority calls them to Unity and Concord, and therefore more especially to Church-Unity, as being the most Principal and the only true Basis of All Other Unity whatever.

I might

I might instance, Sir, in other Respects, wherein you fall short of *showing Manners to the Government*, forasmuch as you *abuse it's Gracious Clemency* towards you, by going about among your Followers to Pervert and *Wring* the *Tolerance and Not-Passing of the Occasional Bill*, into an Argument, that your Separation is approved of by the Government. I omit also another instance, which might shew, that whatever Respect you pretend to have for the Government, you have however much Greater Respect for your Money. And would it please God to Enable you by his Grace to *Dispel* these two Particulars, *Money and Temporal Interest*, I should have Great Hopes of your being *Still* Convinced by my Letters or some such other Means.

This, Sir, is Enough to Shew the Weakness and Insufficiency of your First Reason for *Not writing Publicly* at this Time. Go we on to your second Reason.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

There is enough writ on the subject already to satisfy those that are willing to receive light, and those that willfully shut their eyes I shall have no hope to enlighten, by any thing that may be farther said, had you perused the dissenters defence of themselves published by Dr Owen Mr Baxter Mr Clarkson Mr Alsop & diverse others, you might have seen your self answered before you wrote, and therefore its needless to write again, till something of worth not considered is brought forth, of which sort I see nothing in your letters.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

I may as easily Deny as you, Sir, Affirm, that there is Enough Writ (I mean) on your side already to Satisfie those that are Willing to receive light. And I assure you, that I do not willfully shut my eyes, and therefore you may have hope to Enlighten me, by Any thing that you shall please to say Further and Conducive to that End.

As for the Writings of the Dissenters, Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Alsop &c. it might be Enough to Reply, that had you perused Dr. Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, and the *Cases of the London Divines*, or the *Abridgements* of them, and other Treatises of our Writers publish'd

publish'd since the Writings you refer to; you might have seen that I could not see my self answer'd before I wrote, and therefore that is not needful for you to write still. But I rather choose to alledge, that tho' you may be so Partial as never to Look into any of Our Writers, yet I may know more of your writers than you may imagine, and I had (by God's Bleissing) given you a Publick Proof thereof by this time, had I not been called off to this Consideration of your Letter. On which account I must desire your Patience a little longer for that Tract, which, when it comes forth, will be a Further Evidence that I could not see my self answer'd before I wrote, and that is not needful for you to write, since there is something brought forth in my Letter of so much Worth, as to be Owed and Maintained as True by the foremention'd Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, &c. tho' Denied, and Not Practis'd by you and your Followers.

Thus you may see, if you will not shut your eyes, that neither will your second Reason acquit you from Writing Publickly at this time by way of Answer to my Letters. Take we now the third Reason under Consideration.

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

The case of that unhappy Gent. (the author of the book herewith inclosed) abundantly shews what disadvantage the dissenters lye under in writing, though never so much called upon & provoked thereto, they have been answered with prisons & penaltys & not with arguments, and therefore there is not roome for them to write so freely and fully on their case as the matter would lead them, and as their adversaries may against them, they may say tolle legem & fiat disputatio; but while things are so hedged about with penal laws it is not safe for them to write.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

Mr. De Laune was indeed very Unhappy (not only as to the Misfortune of his Latter end, but also) as to his Principles and Practices, and particularly as to his Plea for the Non-Conformists, it being One of the Meanest pieces even of that kind, and therefore methinks you have Disparag'd your Judgement in choosing to send me this Book before
some

some other of your own Writers. Sir, I can assure you that I had (before I received that which you sent) perused within this Twelve-month the said Book; and that I perused it more carefully than your self, I believe I can subjoin to Good a Proof as will amount to a Demonstration. For had you ever Read but the very first page in the Book after the Title-leaf, you must here have found at the Bottom of the page a Plain Direct Contradiction to what you so Confidently affirm in the part of your Letter last cited, as will appear by placing what you say and what is there said together side by side thus,

Mr. Dowley's Words.

The Publisher (of Mr. De Laune's) Words.

There is not Room for them (i.e. the Dissenters) to Write so Freely and Fully on their Case as the Matter would lead them, and as their Adversaries may against them. They may say, Tolle legem & fiat Disputatio, but while things are so Hedged about with Penal Laws, it is not safe for them to Write.

Blessed be God, We now live in a more Mild and Gentle Reign; in which it will not be accounted Criminal for Men in a Sober and Modest manner, to Declare the Grounds and Reasons of their Faith.

Don't you see, Sir, what an Extraordinary Agreement there is between what is said in your Letter, and in the Book you sent with it? If what you have chosen and sent me to be your own Evidence, will thus give in Witness Against you; and what you design'd to be your own Voucher will thus flatly Give you the Ly, I cannot Help it, and you can Blame only your own Imprudence and Disingenuity in making use of such Fallacious Arguments.

Certainly, Sir, had you not too much Relied on my Ignorance, you would not have ventur'd to Argue at this strange rate, viz. "Mr. De Laune and the other Dissenters could not Write with Freedom and Safety in their own Defence when they incur'd the Punishments once annexed to the breach of the Penal Laws: Therefore I Mr. Dowley cannot write with Freedom and Safety in my Own Defence Now, when the

" Penal

" *Penal Laws are disarm'd of their Sanction, that the Dissenters*
 " *incur no Penalties by the Violation of them; but Liberty of the*
 " *Press as well as of Conscience is Granted to them. Had I ne-*
ver enjoy'd the Happiness of an University-Education, yet
my own Natural Reason would of it self have Enabled me
to Discover the Falseness of your foregoing Argument.
 And I dare say you were Bred at a *Separate* (if at *any*) *Academy*: forasmuch as from your way of Arguing all along your Letter, it may be well infer'd that you are a *Dissenter* from the *Established Rules of Reason as well as Religion.*

Moreover, is it not evident from this Instance, that you, Sir, your self (as well as your Followers) are sometimes *Convinced only at the Sight of Papers and Books*? For had you gone but one Page beyond the Title-Page of Mr. De Laune's *Plea*, you must have found the forementioned *flat contradiction* to what you say in your Letter. And therefore may it not be very reasonably inferred, that you (Good man, out of your *sincere Impartiality*) troubled your self to look no further, but presently *Fell down Convinced (only at the Sight of the Title to Mr. De Laune's Book)* that what followed was without all doubt Answerable thereunto, and so a sufficient *Plea for the Non-Conformists*? On this account I must beg leave to put this *Question* to you, whether you are not *Convinced after the same manner*, that the Works of Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter &c. are just Defences of your *Separation*, namely, because you have *Seen*, or perhaps only *Heard of*, some such Title to their Books? And hence your Followers may (and Others will) gather, what *little Strass or Head is* to be given to your *Recommendation of a Book*, since your Knowledge of It may be thus well suspected to be no other, than what may be most properly called only *Superficial*.

It appears then from what has been said, that what you mention in your Letter as the third Argument for your *Not Writing Publickly* is (even by the Testimony of the *very Book you sent with it and Appeal to*) a *Downright Untruth*, and so No Argument. And therefore it appears also, that you might very well have *Spared that Scrap of Latin, Tolle Legem & fiat Disputatio*; there being no manner of Occasion for it, unless you would have it
 looked

Convinced after the same manner, that the Works of Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, &c. are Just Defences of your Separation, namely, because you have Seen, or perhaps only Heard of, some such Title to their Books? And hence your Followers may (and Others will) gather, what little Stress or Heed is to be given to your Recommendation of a Book, since your Knowledge of It may be thus well suspected to be no other, than what may be most properly called only *Superficial*.

It appears then from what has been said, that what you mention in your Letter as the third Argument for your Not Writing Publickly is (even by the Testimony of the very Book you sent with it and Appeal to) a Down-right Untruth, and so No Argument. And therefore it appears also, that you might very well have Spared that Scrap of Latin, *Tolle Legem & fiat Disputatio*; there being no manner of Occasion for it, unless you would have it looked upon as an Evidence of your Great Skill in the Latin Tongue. And if so, why did you not add likewise a Scrap of Greek and Hebrew for Proofs of your Profound Learning in those Two Languages?

Lastly, in reference to this Part of your Letter I cannot but again put you in mind of your own Admonition abovemention'd, and desire you to consider, whether you do not Shew very little Manners to the Government, whilst (instead of Returning Due Thanks for the Great Liberty graciously indulged to your Party) you still continue on your old Murmurings and Complaints, that you are (after all that is already done for you) too much Hedged in with Penal Laws. Sir, hereby you make it pretty plain What you would be At; What is the Time you stay in Expectation of, for to Write publickly in; and of What Stamp or Sort of Dissenters you are of. But pray, What Liberty will content you? you have heard above from One of your own Brethren, that you may Now Write Freely and Safely in a Sober and Modest Manner. And is not that enough? No; for it seems you are of such a Temper, that you cannot confine your Pen within the narrow Bounds of Sobriety and Modesty.

'Tis time then now to proceed to your last pretended Reason for Not Answering me publickly?

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

What is matter of argument in your papers (which is but little) is mainly the same that the papists plead against the protestants, and what you would replye to them in the defence of the reformation, you may answer your selfe withall as to the most you have to say against us, upon the same principles that you can justify your selves against Rome, we can justify our selves against you, your pretending to make us false teachers for opposing your ceremonies (which is all the evidence you give in that point) lays you open to the papists to prove you the same for your leaving any of theirs.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

In this Paragraph you do, Sir, much as Children are wont to do, when they go about to save themselves from telling a downright Lye, by adding to what they say an [Almost] or the like. For what else is the Design of your slipping in [Mainly] in one place, and in another [as to the most] but to keep your self off as well as you could from maintaining a Notorious Untruth, and yet to seem to say Something, which however amounts at last to Nothing.

For *We defend our Reformation, and justify our selves against Rome, by proving that the Roman Church imposes Sinful Terms of Communion, such as the Belief of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Worshipping of Saints and Images, &c.* But how can you have the Face to say, that you can justify your selves Against Us on the like account; Doth our Church impose such or any other Sinful Term of Communion; Have I not under the Fourth Head of my First Letter particularly consider'd the Common Objections made by your Party, and prov'd that Nothing that you object against us is Sinful? And therefore it lies upon you to Disprove what I have there said.

Again, Sir, how can you so Confidently affirm that All the Evidence I give as to the point of your being a False Teacher,

Teacher, is taken from your *Opposing Ceremonies*? Either you have not Read the Second Head of my Letter to your self, or else you must know that I prove you to be a False Teacher on account also of your Teaching by a False Mission. And what I have said hereupon, you are to Disprove, before you can justify your self against Us, by the same Principles We justify our selves against the Papists.

Nay, under the First Head of my Letter to your self, I prove you to be a False Teacher on account of Falseness of Doctrine, in Opposing the Obedience due to the Governours of the Church in things lawful, and in Teaching or Encouraging the People to leave their true and rightful Ministers, and to follow you out of a wrong Opinion of your being more Gifted, and in other Points, which surely are more than Ceremonies. And therefore your *Opposing Ceremonies* is not the only Evidence I give in for to make you a False Teacher.

I do indeed under the First Head of my Second Letter instance in some Ceremonies, as Kneeling, &c. And surely whosoever Opposes even a bare Ceremony so, as to maintain it to be Sinful, when the Scripture says no such thing, but even approves of it, is so far forth a False Teacher. Nor does the Church of England do so in respect of Any such Ceremony used by the Church of Rome: and therefore 'tis a very false Assertion to say, that the Papists may prove Us False Teachers for Leaving Any of their Ceremonies by the same Reasons, that we prove you to be False Teachers for Opposing our Ceremonies.

And thus I have shewn the Insufficiency of your fourth and last Reason for Not Writing Publickly. Next for your Inference from All taken together.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

For these considerations I forbear at present appearing in print on this head, and though you shall burden the press with your letters answerable to the months of the year, yet I assure you (without greater occasion appear) you shall faile of your expectation of drawing me to the presse on that matter; not but that you have already given abundant room

Mr. Dowley's Letter,

and advantage to expose your nakedness, as the few following hints may serve for all the rest.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

I have, Sir, Letters by me, which as plainly testify that my Letters have been *No Burdens to the Press*, as your own Letter testifies them to be *Heavy Burdens to you*, who act like One that wanting Strength to bear his Burden as he ought, or at least to *Ease Himself of it Handsomely*, without any more ado *Flings it off in a great Passion*.

But pray, Sir, what *Greater Occasion* would you have appear to *Draw you to the Press*? As for the *Considerations* you have mention'd for your *Forbearing at present to appear in Print*, let the *Impartial Reader Judge*, whether they have not been, already proved to be *No Considerations*; and as for the few *Arguments* you offer below in reference to the *Controversy between us*, let the same Reader also judge, whether they are not there proved to be *No Arguments*.

Besides, Sir, you your self mention a *very Good Occasion to Draw you to the Press*, were it so as you say, viz. that I have given abundant room and advantage to expose my *Nakedness*. I am much afraid, lest your Own *Conscience* tells you, that you do not really *Think* so as you have *Writ*; for else I dare say you would not refuse to *Take what is Given you*: and (pray) *Confess ingenuously*, whether this be not the *very first time*, that ever you did refuse to *Take a Gift*?

Well, but though you think not fit to *take Advantage of me Publicly*, or to *Print a Full Answer to my Letters*; yet you are willing *Privately* to let me see, what you *Could do with me*, if you *would*, by the *Few following Hints*, which are such *Extraordinary Feats* as that they may serve for *All the Rest*. Now then for *Dint of Argument*.

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

You seem to glory in christ's example of prayer in his agony, as your *Achilles* to justify formes in that duty, whereas really nothing doth make more against them, for it is evident christ
prayed

prayed then according to the present occasion and exercise of his spirit, and so indeed all prayer ought to be and all that we read of in scripture really was so, but no stinted formes can reach all occasions that may happen, not those whose perfection is so much cryed up by the admirers of them, for upon all new publicke occasions there are still new ones made: christ using the same words the 3 several times he prayed upon that head of his sufferings, makes nothing for you, for that may be and oft is used in extempore prayer, expressing the desire by the same words, when there is occasion to pray oft for the same mercy, and you may as well argue from christ's preaching to have formes of sermons, as from his praying to have such in that duty, for he oft repeated the same expressions in his doctrine as well as in his devotion, as may be seen Math: 5: 21: 27: 33: 38: v: & chapt: 23: 13: 14: 15: 25: 27: 29: v:

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

You threaten'd, Sir, to give some few Hints how you could Expose my Nakedness: but All such Readers as are capable of understanding the Oddness of the Expression, will (I am apt to believe) think that you have in the very next Sentence notoriously Exposed your Own Nakedness, by introducing the mention of Achilles after so absurd and ridiculous a manner. May I ask, how oft you have used this Fine Expression in your Discourses to your Hearers, telling them, that they ought to Glory in Christ's Example as their Achilles? How oft soever you have used it, doubtless it could not but carry along with it a Great Deal of Edification; and it may very well serve for a Shrew'd Hint, How justly you Deserve the Title of an Edifying Preacher. May not One be induced hereby to Imagine, that, notwithstanding the Out-cry you make against Popish Unscriptural Saints, there are also some Puritan Unscriptural Saints, among whom this same Achilles is esteem'd by you as Chief, or rather more than a Saint, or Christ himself? For surely in your Comparison Achilles has plainly the Pre-eminence given him even before our Blessed Saviour, and is represented as a more Extraordinary Person. What a Strange Surprize then must it be to

such of your Followers as have heard you use this Expression, to be Undeceived and told that this same *Achilles* (if not a *Puritan Saint* commonly unknown, but *That* spoken of in common Authors) was no other than a *Pagan* or *Heathen Hero* or *Great Warriour*; and consequently that this your Expression may be Justly Censured as being in some sort *Irreligious and Prophane*!

In short, the chief Reason I can think of for your thus pulling in (as it were by the Head and Shoulders) the *Pagan* or *Heathen Achilles*, is this, that you had a Mind to shew, how much more *Learned* you are than such a *Minister and Doctor* of the Church as my self; and that you are extremely well Read in *Homer* and other *Greek Authors*. But I must beg leave to observe, that had you been pleased to have contrived some Occasion for introducing the mention of the *Greek Word* or *Name* writ in its proper or *Greek Letters*, it would have been somewhat a *Better Hint* of your *Vast Skill* in the *Greek Tongue*.

Thus much for the *Manner* of your Expression; let us now consider what you *Aim at* thereby; and the *Meaning* thereof, as well as I can guess, must be in *Plain English* to this Effect, viz. that I *seem to Glory in Christ's Example of Prayer in his Agony*, as a main Argument to justify *Forms* in that Duty. Sir, you need not have said, that I *seem to Glory*, for I am not Ashamed readily to Own, that I do *Actually Glory in Christ's Example*, and that *because it is Christ's Example*, and so the *Greatest* that a *True Christian* can *Glory in*, and of the *Greatest Authority* to justify *Forms of Prayer*.

You say indeed that there is really Nothing that makes more *Against Forms* than *Christ's Prayer in his Agony*. But then you are pleased only to say so, and immediately to subjoyn (to save me the Labour) a very good Proof of the *Falseness* of what you have said just afore. For (add you,) it is *Evident* *Christ* prayed then according to the *Present Occasion*: and may not I as truly add, that so likewise *Our Forms of Prayer* are *Suitable* or *According to the Present Occasion* when they are used? You farther add, that *Christ* then prayed according to the *Exercise* of

of his Spirit. Now I have observed (p. 19, 20 of my Letter to a Dissenting Parishioner) that by this and the like Expressions Can be meant but One of these two things, either Making a New Prayer by the Assistance of the Spirit, or Saying a Prayer already made with a Spiritual Devotion. In the former Sense our Saviour could then pray but only the first time; the two other times He cannot possibly be said to pray according to the Exercise of his Spirit any other ways than in the latter Sense of the Words, or as it denotes to pray or repeat a Prayer with the Spirit of Devotion. In like manner our Common Prayer may (considering the Great Piety of the Compilers of It, and with what Due Preparation they set about the Work, by Earnestly Praying God for his Special Assistance therein) justly be esteemed as First Drawn up or Made by the Assistance of the Spirit; and whosoever Rightly uses it ever since, may be truly said to Pray according to the Exercise of his Spirit or Spiritual Devotion. And thus you may see, if you do not shut close your Eyes, that even according to your Own Account there is an Excellent Agreement between Christ's Prayer in his Agony and our Forms of Prayer.

But (go you on) No Stinted Forms can reach All Occasions that may happen. Sir, I have had (perhaps you may call it) the Misfortune to be so much used (by that Sort of Study which I take a peculiar Delight in) to Connexion, that I cannot get over this same little Particle [But] without considering how it comes in here, which is thus: say you Nothing really makes more against Forms than Christ's Prayer in his Agony; then for Proof hereof you add, For Christ then prayed according to the Present Occasion, But no stinted Forms can reach All Occasions, Therefore (----- What? will it follow that) No Stinted Form can be According to the Present Occasion; This surely will never follow by Any Rules of Logick or Right Reasoning. Pray then, Sir, give me leave now to give you a Kind Admonition, viz. that How much soever you may think fit to Despise Logick in your Discourses to your Hearers; yet whenever you Write to Others, or think fit to Appear in Print, you would be pleased to have

more Regard to the Rules (tho' they be likewise *Stinted Forms*) of *Syllogism*. By these you might have perceived, that a *Stinted Form*, tho' it may not reach *All Occasions*, yet it may be very well used *According* to a *Present Occasion*. Nay, you might have perceived, that what you say in this respect *Against Stinted Forms*, holds as much *Against* our Saviour's Prayer in his Agony: for tho' it was then according to the *Present Occasion*, yet surely you will Own that It will Not Reach *All Occasions*. Nay, this your Objection makes as much *Against Extempore Prayer* as *Stinted Forms*: for surely you will Allow that even the same *Extempore Prayer* will Not reach *All Occasions*; otherwise why do you make New Prayers so very Often? And therefore pray see into what strange Difficulties you run your self; For 1st. you require to a Good Prayer Two Qualities, which are utterly Inconsistent the One with the Other, viz. To be Peculiar to One Present Occasion, and yet to Reach *All Occasions*.

2. You make the Addition of a Few New Occasional Prayers twice or thrice in the whole Year to be a Token of Great Imperfection in Our Forms; and yet Cry up Newness of Prayer used every time you Meet as a Token of the Greatest Perfection in your *Extempore Prayer*. And now can Men be guilty of Greater Contradictions than you and your Party are in this Case? Or can there be a clearer Evidence of you and your Party being quite Blinded with Prejudice and Partiality, than your not being Able to Discern your so Apparent Self-Contradiction?

And yet your Own Blindness in this Case will appear still more by what follows in your Letter. For tho' you say indeed, that Christ's using the same Words the three several times, &c. makes Nothing for Us, yet you are again unwittingly so very Complaisant as to prove the contrary by adding, that this may be, and oft is used in *Extempore Prayer*, expressing the Desire by the same Words, when there is Occasion to pray oft for the same Mercy. For herein you imply as Good an Argument as can be Desired for Forms, which stands thus; "When there is Occasion to pray for the same Mercies, then the Desire may
" be

"be exprest by the same Words: But there is Occasion
 "to pray daily for the same (viz. Common) *Miseries*:
 "Therefore the *Desire* may be exprest daily by the same
 "Words". This, Sir, is no other in Effect than your
 Own Argument, and 'tis indeed an Unanswerable One,
 namely *Not Against*, but *For the Use of Forms*; forasmuch
 as to Express the *Desire* daily by the same Words, is the
 same as to Use daily the same Form of Prayer.

Nay, this your Argument will prove, not only the
 Lawfulness of *Forms* in general, but also the Lawfulness
 of Repeating some parts of them several Times, and so
 affords a very Good Answer to that Weak Objection made
 by some of your Writers Against the Repetition of the
 Lord's Prayer, &c. in our Liturgy.

By this time you begin (I suppose) to perceive,
 whither you are got, and how the Stream of Truth has
 been so strong as to have forced you without your own
 Will On our Side, and to write *For Stinted Forms*, even
 when you designed to write *Against* them. It concerns
 you to take care and clear your self among your Brethren,
 lest they begin to suspect that, tho' you pretend Out-
 wardly that you have met with no Conviction in my Papers,
 yet you are Inwardly Convinced so far, as to pretend to
 write in Defence of their Cause only, that you might the
 Better Betray it, and Expose or Lay Open the Weakness
 and Badness of it.

As to what follows in your Letter, concerning Argu-
 ing to have *Forms of Sermons* from Christ's Repeating the
 same Expressions in his Doctrine, &c. is so very Extra-
 vagant, as that it serves only to Argue that you are not
 very Good at Argumentation; since there is by no means a
 just Parallel between the Instance I make use of for *Forms*
 of Prayer, and the Instances mentioned by you for *Forms*
 of Sermons. Nay, if your way of Arguing holds good,
 you may run your self before you are aware into another
 Noose or Snare, and prove that you your self Preach by *Form*,
 if so be you keep to the Method of Doctrine, Division, Use,
 &c. But perhaps you are so Averse to *Forms*, that you
 take particular Care, that your Discourses should be Far
 enough from having Any thing of Doctrine or Use, or Any
 Method at all.

But

But tho' what you alledge, is *no Good Argument for Forms of Sermons*; yet I assure you, I am by no means *Against them*; but on the contrary have a *very great Opinion of them*, as well as of *Forms of Prayer*. For I think it might be of *Great Benefit*, and *Prevent a Great Deal of Mischief*, was there a *Book of Sermons* drawn up by *Judicious Persons* on *All Subjects fit for Common Auditories*, and *All Ministers or Teachers Obligated to Use them*, unless on *some Special Occasions*. And to such an *Injunction* I should willingly submit, and so testify that I am not so *Conceited of my Own Performances*, as *Another* may be who thinks me so, and would be apt to refuse such a *Submission*, whether out of *Humility* let others judge.

Thus have I largely shewn the *Great Weakness* of your *Objections against my Arguments for Forms* drawn from our *Saviour's Prayer in his Agony*. You go on next to your *Objections against my Arguments for Forms*, drawn from the *Lord's Prayer*; and I shall attend you, and give them their *Due Consideration*.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

You likewise insist much on the *Lords prayer* given to the *disciples*, thinking you have thereby convincing prooffe for *forms*, whereas for ought you have said on that head, that may rather be taken as a *directory* than a *forme*, the different relation of it by the *2. Evangelists* may signifie so much, and the *Apostles practice* may confirm those thoughts, of whom we never read in *scripture* that they used it in the *set words*, but suited their expressions in prayer to their severall occasions as the *spirit* gave them utterance, as may be seen. *Acts 1: 24: 25: Chapt 4: 24: to the 30th.* and more-over the subject matter of that prayer will backe this sense, for if it be enjoined to all that profess the name of *Christ* to use in the *set words*, then multitudes are commanded to speake falsely, to call god in *heaven* their father, when they are of their father the *Di-vel* in *hell*, as *Christ* told the *Jews* notwithstanding their profession and claim of god as their father *Iohn 8*, and I wonder how men of violent spirits can say that prayer, begging for forgiveness as they forgive others, when indeed they are full of rage and fury, and far from any forgiving temper;

Dr,

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Instead of *barely affirming*, that the *Lord's Prayer* may rather be taken as a *Directory* than a *Pattern*, for ought I have said on that head; you should have some way or other *Disproved* the Reasons I have alledged to that purpose; particularly you should have *disproved*, that those words of our Saviour, *When ye pray, Say, Our Father &c.* do come up to the very Same as if he had said, *When ye pray say this Form, Our Father &c.* And if when our Saviour thus plainly intimates, that it is a *Form*, you will nevertheless boldly *gainsay* it, I cannot expect that you should have due *Regard* to Any thing I can offer, when you refuse to have due *Regard* to what our Saviour himself has said.

The *Different relations* given by the two Evangelists are so far from *Disproving* the *Lord's Prayer* to be a *Form*, that they mightily *Confirm* it; forasmuch as they prove that this Prayer was prescribed by our Saviour at two different places, and so at two different times. If by the *different relation* of It you refer to that *Little Difference of Expression* which is to be found in the two Evangelists, you might have perceived that this can be no material *Objection*, had you but considered, that our Saviour did not deliver his Prayer in the *Greek tongue*, and that the *different Translation* of a *Form* out of One tongue into Another cannot possibly prove it to be *No Form*. And as to the *Omission* of the *Doxology* in *St. Luke*, that can only *Prove*, that the said *Doxology* (as not being *Properly* a part of the *Prayer*) may be *omitted* or *added* by our Saviour's own permission; and agreeably hereunto you may see in our *Liturgy*, that the *Lord's Prayer* is there appointed to be repeated sometimes *with*, sometimes *without* the *Doxology*. In short, if such a *Difference of Expression*, or such an *Omission* as is above specified, will make what was designed to be a *Form* to become *No Form*, then you must allow also Our *Common Prayer* to be *No Form*, since there are several Parts of It to be sometimes *Omitted*, and at other times *Inserted*; and since it is but saying *Most Mighty* instead of *Almighty*

mighty or the like, and it ceases to be a *Form*. And if so, then you are to *Invent* new pretended Reasons to *Excuse* your self from *Not Complying* with It; since your *Objection* against it as a *Form* will no longer hold, if this last *Objection* holds Good. And thus by the way you may further see the Badness of your Cause, when the *Objections*, which you are forced to take up with, *Destroy One the Other*.

I could add a great deal more still for the further confirmation of this matter, which you might have found in *Our Writers* upon this Subject, and so *seen your self fully Answered herein afore you wrote*. Neither will I barely Say this, but refer you to some particular Treatises, viz. *Certain Cases of Conscience resolved concerning the Lawfulness of Joining with Forms of Prayer*, Part. 2. Cas. 5. in Vol. 2d. of *London-Divines Cases*: or else in the *Abridgment of them*, Ch. 3. or in *Dr. Whitby's Annotations on Matth. 6. 9. &c.*

In the forecited Places of each of the said Books you might likewise have *seen your self fully Answered afore you wrote*, as to what comes next in your Letter, viz. that the *Apostles Practice may* (you dare not speak out so great an Untruth, as to say, the *Apostles Practice doth*) confirm the Opinion of the *Lord's Prayer* being only a *Directory*, forasmuch as we never read in *Scripture* that they used It in set words, but suited their expressions to their several occasions, as the spirit gave them utterance. For in the forementioned Books you would have been taught, that what *St. John* saith of *Christ*, viz. that there were many things which *Jesus* did, which were not written, holds true also of the *Apostles*: and that you may as well conclude from the Silence of the *Scripture*, that the *Apostles* did not Baptize in the name of the Father, &c. that they never prayed before *Christ's Resurrection*, that many of them never preached the Gospel, &c. as that they never used the *Lord's Prayer*. And as to the Gift of Utterance you might have learnt from the Books abovementioned, "That it was Miraculous and Particular to the Primitive Age; that you may as well pretend to the Gift of Tongues, as that of Utterance; " and

"and that if your Prayers are thus *Inspired* as those of the Apostles were, they must be of *Equal Authority* with the Scripture; which even the *Sober Dissenters* themselves will not maintain, but disavow.

I confess that I cannot refer you to the forementioned, or any other Books for an Answer to your next *Objection*, (methinks you begin to *Think Highly* of It hereupon, but there is no such Occasion, this happening) Not because It is so Good as to be *Unanswerable*, but because It is so very Bad and *Extravagantly Absurd*, as that I know of No One of your own Party so very Weak as to Make Use of It, but your self; and now you have brought it forth, it is really not Worth an Answer. However in Civility to you I will not pass it by wholly Unregarded; but shall put you in mind, that you would have done well to have Considered, that supposing the Lord's Prayer to have been enjoined (not to All that profess the name of Christ, but) only to True Christians to use in the set Words, yet this had been abundantly enough to have proved the said Prayer to have been designed for a Form; inasmuch as a Form that is used but by Ten, is as much a Form as if it was used by Ten Thousand. Again you would have done well to have Considered, that this same Objection of yours, if it holds Good, makes it Unwarrantable for Multitudes of Christians to say not only the Lord's Prayer, but Any Other Whatever. Once more you would have done well to have Considered, that this your Objection carries in it a most severe Reflection on a Certain Dissenting Teacher and his most Zealous Followers. For say you, No one is commanded to say the Lord's Prayer, that is a Child, not of God, but of the Devil: Now 'tis notoriously known, that a Certain Dissenting Teacher and his most Zealous Followers never say the Lord's Prayer. Therefore is it not a Natural Consequence, that the said Certain Dissenting Teacher and his Followers make themselves to be Children, not of God, but of the Devil? In like manner say you, No One is commanded to say the Lord's Prayer, that is full of Rage and Fury, and Far from a Forgiving Temper. To which may be subjoyned, a Certain Dissenting Teacher,

&c.

Sec. never says the Lord's Prayer; Therefore may it not naturally be inferred, that the said Dissenting Teacher, &c. is full of Rage and Fury, and Far from a Forgiving Temper? Now if any one will cast such severe Reflections on himself, &c. who shall Help it, or with whom can he be Angry in justice, but only with himself, for not acting more Discreetly and Uprightly.

Well, but you have Still in reserve Another Objection against *Forms*, supposing those already drawn from the Lord's Prayer will not Hold; which is as follows.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

But suppose it as you say that it was given by Christ as a set form, what is that to other devised ones, because Christ the head of the Church and lawgiver might give his disciples a set short form, it doth not therefore follow that the servants may do so too, if there were no further imposition than what christ hath made you would have no quarrell with the dissenters; so that from all your arguing from scripture there doth not appear there any warrant for forms, and therefore those that say so are not false teachers but ministers of truth, and those that say the contrary may more easily be laid under that denomination.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

You needed not, Sir, to have given your self the Trouble of making the Objection contained in this last Paragraph, nor me the Trouble of Answering it, since you might also have seen this fully Answered afore you wrote, had you consulted the forecited places of the two first Books above-mentioned; or had you been but pleased to have duly Considered the First Head of my First Letter. For you might hence have learnt, that what Christ thought good to prescribe to his Church for its Benefit, the same or like without all doubt may be prescribed by Such of his Servants, as He has entrusted the Government of his Church with. And also you might have learnt, that *All Impositions*, which Such his Servants think fit to make in things not Forbidden, are to be look'd upon and obey'd

obey'd as *Christ's own Impositions*, and therefore that the *Dissenters* have no just reason to *Quarrel* with us.

I cannot well conceive, why you should give such a particular Intimation of the *Shortness* of the *Lord's Prayer*, unless you design it by way of *Hint*, that our *Set Form* is too long. But then this *Hint* will serve also for an *Hint* of your *Self-Contradiction*, whilst you *blame* our *Common Prayer* on that very same account, whereby you endeavour to *Recommend*, and for which your Party are wont to *Cry up*, your *Extempore Prayers*, namely for the *Length* of them. As for what follows in your last Paragraph, it is an *Hint*, that you (as well as some of your Followers) are *Resolved* that, let me *Write* or *Say* what I will, never so much or so clear *Truth*, yet you will have no *Regard* to It. I shall therefore only add, that if you will but have *Any Regard* (tho' not to Me, yet) to Some of the most *Eminent* of your own *Writers*, and to the *Universal Judgment* of *All the Reformed Churches* beyond the Seas, you must acknowledge (as will appear in my next *Treatise*) that there is in *Scripture* sufficient warrant for *Forms*, and therefore those that say there doth not appear such warrant, are justly chargeable with being *False Teachers* on that account.

Thus much for what you say by way of *Objection* Against my Arguments to justify *Forms* of Prayer: you go on next to say Something in *Defence* of *Extempore Prayer*.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

Before you declaim so loudly against *extempore prayer* you would do well to clear your-self of those scriptures that plainly hold it forth as *Rom: 8: 26: 27:* where the *Apostle* sets forth the *Spirit* helping our *infirmity* in the matter as well as in the manner of that duty, which would be altogether needless if we be tied to a *forme* before our eyes, where the matter is limited & known beforehand, & be also with the *Spirit* so works sometimes in the children of God in that duty, as that it cannot be uttered, but its easie to utter a *forme* that is before us; & before you so wholly run down this way of praying you would do well to answer *bishop Wilkins* upon that subject, who

who p. 12: saith, that to despise it, & use reproachful expressions about it, is for the most part a signe of a prophane heart, & of persons being strangers to the power and comfort of the duty; And also you should be agreed among your selves of its sinfulness, for many of your own communion practise it, & your arguing will make them as much false teachers as us.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Would you, Sir, but have given your self leave duly to have considered what I say in my Letters concerning *Extempore Prayer*, you would have perceived that All this last Paragraph of your Letter is *Nothing at all* to the purpose.

For first, All that is said in my Letter relates to *Extempore Prayer in Publick*: and I leave Any one of common Capacity to judge, whether Rom. 8. 26, 27. can possibly be understood of *Publick Extempore Prayer*. For as the Apostle saith in the former part of the verse, that *the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*, so in the latter part he tells us how it doth so, viz. by *interceding for Us with Groanings that cannot be Uttered*. But now can such Groanings as Cannot be Uttered be applied to the Matter of *Publick Extempore Prayers* which is *actually Uttered*, without the plainest Absurdity and Contradiction?

And indeed you are (after your wonted manner) so kind as in the next Sentence to Disprove your self by saying the very same in effect as I have just now said. For say you, *the Spirit so works sometimes in the Children of God in that Duty (viz. of Prayer) as that it cannot be Uttered*, whence you infer, that this cannot be understood of *Forms of Prayer*, because it is *easy to utter a Form that is before Us*. In like manner I argue, that *the Spirit's working in Prayer so as that it cannot be uttered*, Cannot possibly be understood of the Matter of your *Extempore Prayers*, forasmuch as you do *actually Utter* that in your Congregations. And thus you have your self Disproved the Texts alledged by you to justify *Extempore Prayer*, and so have saved me the labour of *Clearing my self of them*,
and

Rules, in your Prayer. Where it clearly follows, that my Arguing will be the better made, than that which is much as you and other Dissenting Teachers, will be.

I have now largely consider'd all you have said in your Letter by way of Opposition Against the Arguments made use of by the *Pro-Form* of Prayer; and shall leave the Impartial Reader to judge, whether I have not proved the several Particulars urged by you to be *False* (as it were, but) of your own Nature. And shall only observe here further on this Head, that notwithstanding the *False* you pretend to *Form*, yet I am sure to believe, that your Prayers and Services carefully taken in writing, for one Twelve-month, or but for Six-months; it might be said, that both your Prayers and Services are at the bottom the *same* than *Form*, for what *they* and *change* several ways, (just as if One should begin sometime with one part, and at time with another part of the *Common Prayer*) and that you only *Debat* and *Play* your Weak and Unstable People by giving out, that you *may* *change*. But whether you pray *English* or *No*, it is all one, at least since the event, that if you *praying* and *praying* be like to your *Writing*, it is far from being *by the Spirit*; and yet I leave you to find out a Reason, (if you can) why you should not pretend to *Write* by the Spirit as well as to *Pray* or *Preach* by the Spirit, since the Apostles, who *Prayed* and *Preached* by the Spirit, did also *Write* by the same Spirit.

The next Head you shall be to take notice of, is that of Ordinations of which you speak thus: *that I should not yet* (imagine you) to support I will admit my moving and say one word Mr. Dewees's Letter and you shall

I cannot forbear further observing, how the *Form* of Prayer constrains you to hold the *Form* of Ordination to be *the same* in *all* times, and *whenever* *that* *will* *under* *this* *name* *that* *has* *for* *us* *since* *disputed* *of* *this* *point*, *as* *have* *in* *concern* *with* *a* *pre* *fixing* *our* *selves* *to* *have* *positive* *institutions* *&* *no* *other* *ways* *all* *along* *the* *pages* *of* *the* *Ordination* *as* *well* *as* *other* *things* *were* *disordered*, *as* *for* *the* *times* *of* *reformation* *things* *should* *be* *restored* *to* *their* *primitive* *pattern*, *as* *well* *as* *other* *things*, *was* *in* *all* *other* *reformed* *Churches*, *and* *even* *in* *your* *the* *superiority* *of*

bishops above presbyters was long after the reformation looked upon but as a humane constitution, as many bishops themselves have acknowledged, and the crying it up as jure divina is but of late standing.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Before I enter upon the Arguing part of your foregoing paragraph, I desire to know what you mean by the strange Word [*Presbyters*.] For I am not ashamed to own, that I do not remember that in my Reading, I ever met with it afore. I know indeed that some of the Clergy are called *Presbyters*, and that such is the True way of Writing the *English* Name, you might have learnt from my Letters, had you either so much as Read them, or had you not been Resolved rather to Spell Falsely, than to Agree with Me in the manner of Spelling the said Word. I believe, that even your mighty Greek Hero or Champion *Achilles* will not be able to justify your skill in the *Greek Language* so far, as to Free it from being much called in question on this account of your Spelling the aforesaid word, not with due Analogy to the Original *Greek* Word. Had the word occurred in your Letter but once so writ, I had took no notice of it, but had ascribed it to mere Inadvertency; but when it stands there so writ no less than three or four times, 'tis evident that it must proceed from Another Cause. But after all I will do you this piece of Justice to Acquaint the World, that (since I received your Letter) I have been informed by an Honest Lay-man, (which I particularly mention, to prevent your having Hard Thoughts of Any Clergy-man) that it appears from your Letter to Me, that you are within some late years very much Come off from that Rigid Non-Conformity you formerly shewed to the Received Way of Spelling. And therefore since you have been thus Brought over in Some Tolerable measure to Orthography, I will not quite Despair, but that you may in time be Brought over likewise to Orthodoxy. Thus much then for the Falseness of your Spelling, next for the Falseness (not of your Arguing, for you have I acknowledge avoided that, by contenting your self only with Bare Assertions; and therefore I can

proceed

proceed to shew the *Falseness* but) of *What* you *Assert* or *Say*, in that part of your Letter we are now upon.

You say then that *I yield the Power of Ordination to Presbyters in Scripture-times*; which (in the Sense you understand the words in) is apparently *False*, as may be seen more especially p. 32. of my Letter to you, where I prove that the *Power of Ordination* did not belong to *Presbyters properly so called in the New Testament*, and therefore did not belong to such *Presbyters* as your *Ordination was Derived from*; and with whom therefore you are altogether Concerned, how vainly soever you profess your self to be of *Scripture-Institution*. 'Tis true indeed, that you have no Concern with any other Order set up since the *Scripture-times* under the Name of *Presbyters*, and *Divested of the Power of Ordination*, because there never was *Any* such Order, no not so much as mentioned (as I know of) by *Any One* but your self: and your Mention of It plainly shews that you are to Learn the great Difference between being *Divested*, and *Not Invested*.

As to the *Irregularities* which had crept into *Ordination* during the *Papal Usurpation*, they were removed at the *Reformation* in our Church; and *All things were Restored to their Primitive pattern* more exactly in our Church than in *Other Reformed Churches*, as in other Instances, so particularly because *We retained the Distinction of the Three Ministerial Orders* in agreement to the *Primitive Pattern*.

Whereas you say that the *Crying up of the Superiority of Bishops to Presbyters as jure Divino is but of Late Standing*, you do only betray thereby your Want of Knowledge in *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. For a *Right Knowledge* in these would have convinced you, that the *aforesaid Doctrine* is no other than the *Received Doctrine of the Primitive Church*, and that such as did *Oppose it* in the more *Early times* were always *Censured and Condemned* by the *General Consent of the Antient Councils*. And in like manner ever since the *Reformation* such as have gone about to Call the said *Doctrine* in Question, or Pretend the *aforesaid Superiority* to be only of *Humane Institution*, have always been looked upon in our Church as *Heterodox and Unsound*. And if you really know of *Many Bishops* that have acknowledged the *E-*

episcopal Superiority to Presbyters to be of no other than Humane Institution, you would have done some Kindness in giving their Particular Names, that Others may know them too; if you do not truly know Many, you ought not to have made so very Free with that High Sacred Order, as to cast such a Slur upon It. But be what you say as it will, out of my Profound and Bounden Reverence to that Apostolical Order I shall only Add, that I leave you or Any Other (whosoever) to Disprove what I have said concerning the Apostolical Constitution of Episcopacy as received in the Church of England, in p. 33 &c. of my Letter to your self: and also that supposing (after all) Our Episcopacy to be only of Humane Constitution, yet you are bound in Conscience to Comply with It and Obey your Bishop, as may be gathered from what I have proved in my First Head of my First Letter, and may be seen more particularly and largely proved by Mr. Bennet in his Discourse of Schism ch. 9: and lastly as may be plainly and fairly inferred from the Practice even of such Bishops as you mention. For though These Bishops may or might think their Superiority over Presbyters to be of Humane Constitution, yet they must in Charity be supposed to think it notwithstanding to be a Lawfull Constitution and Not Disagreeable to the Rule of Scripture, or else they would (Agree with you in other respects as well as this, and) stand Self-Condemed, namely by exercising a Power which they judged Unlawfull.

Well, but if All you have hitherto Alledged, be thus proved to make nothing Against what I have said Concerning the Invalidity of your Presbyterian Ordination; yet you think there remains still Three Rocks in my way, and I must unavoidably run upon All three. But I doubt not but I shall meet with Better Success, and so shall venture on with good Heart and Courage.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

Your arguing to overthrow our ordination runs you upon 3 rocks. I: to advance an uninterrupted succession of ordination from the Apostles to these times, which can never be made out, and all
protestants

protestants writing against the papists laugh at it, to defend it you must trace it through all the darkness of popery, where you will have many insuperable difficulties, you will find many schismes, many popes at a time severally ordaining bishops, and very hard to know which was the true, and whether your succession be from the true & not the schismaticall, and how you will clear it from not proceeding from pope Jone I leave to you to determine, your argument seems to inferre a certain vertue dropping from the fingers of the ordainer on the ordained, which savours ranke of popery, tending to make orders a sacrament, which all protestants deny.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

It is what the Church of England justly Glories in, that She is Able to Make out her Claim to an *Uninterrupted Succession of Ordination from the Apostles to these times*; and whosoever asserts the Contrary, only betrays his own Ignorance in Church-history. Though your Followers are so Weak in themselves, and so unreasonably Civil to you, as to Believe whatever you say, only because you say It; yet you must not expect that Others will be so Pua upon, but that they will look for Good Proof of what you say, before they believe It. Whereas on the contrary you are not pleased to give One Single Positive Proof that the afore-said Succession hath been ever Interrupted, but content your self Barely to Assert with Great Confidence and as Great Untruth, that Such a Succession can never be made out, and that All the Protestants writing against the Papists laugh at it. Pray consider whether you do not deserve to be laughs at your self for an Assertion so Groundless and apparently False. Surely the Episcopal Protestants make up a very Considerable Part of the Protestants, and Any one but your self would think in reason, that These do not laugh at the Papists for what they themselves maintain and know to be True.

As for what you Hint concerning the Darknes of Popery, the Plurality of Popes at the same time, and a Pope Jone, they are All of them so many more Hints of your Want of Knowledge in Church-Affairs. For in the Darkest time of Popery there is Great Light as to the Point of Ordination,

and your Thinking *Otherwise* is only an Evidence of your being Extremely in the *Dark*, as to the true State of *that Age*, which is commonly called the *Dark Age*, and as to the true Reason of It's being so Called.

And the *Plurality of Popes at the same time* doth not in the least Prejudice the *Succession of Ordination*; and your thinking *Otherwise* is only a Proof of your not Knowing, that the same Person, which is *not a Rightfull Pope*, yet may be a *Rightfull Bishop*; and consequently may have a *just Right* to exercise the *Power of Ordination*, though He may not have a *just Right* to exercise the *Papal Authority*, as received in the *Church of Rome*. And this Consideration being of *Universal Extent*, I purposely pass by Others, which might be urged in reference to our Church in particular.

However, I cannot but observe from hence that you have unawares let drop from your Pen what is sufficient to prove your self to be a Schismatical Teacher. For whereas you say, that in the *Darkness of Popery we shall find Many Schisms, many Popes at the same time*, and that 'tis hard to Know, which was the *True*, and which the *Schismatical*; you plainly acknowledge, that there may be a *Schism*, where there is a *perfect Agreement* not only in *Fundamentals*, but also in *Rites and Ceremonies*, if so be there is notwithstanding an *Open Opposition between the Members of the said Church*; and agreeably that whenever there were many *Popes at a time*, there could be but *One true or Rightfull Pope*, and the *Other* were to be esteem'd *Schismatical*. Whence it will follow much more, that the *Dissenters* are guilty of *Schism*, because though they May Agree with us in *Fundamentals*, yet they openly Oppose the *Church of England* in other respects: and it will also follow that Any one that sets himself up to be a *Teacher in opposition to the True and Rightfull Minister of any Parish*, he thereby becomes a *Schismatical Teacher*, namely (if for no other reason, yet for this alone, viz.) because He Opposes openly the *True and Rightfull Minister*.

Let the Reader now judge, whether you are not Run upon a *Rock* so far, as miserably to Shatter and Split the Cause you are embarked in: and yet it will presently appear that
you

you have received still more Damage as to the Reputation of your own Scholarship. For whereas you leave me to clear the Succession of our Ordination from proceeding from Pope Jone, I am sure this is as far as any thing Can be, from Carrying along with it an *Insurmountable Difficulty*. For though I do by no means love to be Foolishly Confident without grounds, yet I may venture to say, that 'twill prove an *Insurmountable Difficulty* for you to make out, that there ever was a Pope Jone. Indeed I have read of a Pope Joan, and if this be the same you mean, you have given a new Hint, that you cannot yet quite shake off your Old Non-conformity to true Spelling. Had One of your poor Ignorant Hearers thus spelt his wife's name, it had been easily Excuseable; but for Mr. Dowley, that Great Scholar, that is so much read in the Greek (or suppose only in the English) New Testament, Not to Know how to Write the said Name more Conformably to the Word it is derived from, viz. Joanna, or at least, to the Received Way of Spelling It among the Learned, is not so easily to be Excused.

Hitherto you have given (in this paragraph of your Letter) Hints of your Unacquaintedness with Church-History and True Spelling; but you give in the last place an Hint (of what is much worse and more Discommendable, viz.) your *Disingenuity*. For I appeal to you your self, whether you do not well know, that We of the Church of England as well as Other Protestants Deny Orders to be a Sacrament, and Condemn the contrary Opinion as a vain piece of Popery. And therefore Could you but have prevailed on your self to Deal for once Ingeniously, you could not have suspected Any thing that I have said of the *Virtue of Ordination* to tend in the least toward the Popish Opinion; but would have understood It to import no more than what is Allowed by All that Allow Ordination, viz. that the Imposition of Hands is the Scriptural way of Setting men apart to the Ministry; and that No Persons can Duely take upon them to exercise such Imposition of Hands, but Those that have had the said Power or Authority Duely transmitted down to them from the Apostles, as have the Bishops of Our Church. But the foregoing Instance is not the only Instance of your

Disingenuity, as will appear from what comes next in your Letter.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

2: your discourse drives you to set up an order of presbyters that the scripture is unacquainted with, viz, not having power of ordination, which you own scripture presbyters might have, and in so doing I shall leave it to you to consider, how you can clear your selfe of that charge you lay against us; and how you can make yourself an officer of scripture appointment.

DR. WELLS'S Answer.

Sir, either you must own that you did not carefully read over my Letter to you, or else you must be guilty of notorious *Disingenuity*, in misrepresenting what I say, so as you do in the foregoing paragraph. Have I not there expressly prov'd (p. 31, 32) that it is evident from 1 Tim. 4. 14. compar'd with 2 Tim. 1. 6. as also from Titus 1. 5. that the Presbytery of Presbyters there mentioned had not the Power of Ordination? and therefore is it any other than a downright Untruth for you to say, that I set up an Order of Presbyters that the Scripture is unacquainted with? Wherefore this same Assertion of yours being thus plainly False, All that you infer from It falls to the ground of it self; and my Charge against the Validity of your Order still holds Good, and I my self appear from the Texts last cited to be an Officer of Scripture-appointment, tho' not invested with the Power of Ordination.

As to what you mention concerning my Owning that Scripture-Presbyters might have the Power of Ordination, would you have been so *Ingenuous* as to have Carefully Read and Considered, what I have said concerning the Promiscuous Use of the Word [Presbyter] in the Scripture-times, you could not but have perceived that what I say upon the forementioned Point, Cannot possibly make Any thing for you. And whenever you shall think fit to Undertake to Disprove what I have said on this head, paragraph by paragraph, as I have done here in reference to your Letter; then I perswade my self that you will find that what I have Allowed, makes Nothing For, but Much Against you, and that you will meet with some Conviction inwardly, tho' you may think it proper to stifle It.

I have

I have I think clearly escaped *Running upon my Rock* hitherto; and of the *Three Rocks* you mentioned there remains now but *One* more to be escaped; and I assure my self of the like Good success, and so proceed on.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

3: you unchurch most if not all the reformed churches beyond sea, for they have no other ordination then what is among the dissenters, and so we may see your charity to the protestant religion, that while you acknowledge the papal ministry, you disown that in the protestant churches abroad; I wish by the advancing of this opinion you be not pulling down yourselves with your own hands, for nothing renders any party more hateful to god & man, than such monopolising true ministry and salvation among themselves, this gave a good step towards the overthrow of Rome, she would be the only church though wretchedly degenerate & the mother of harlots, no salvation without conformity to her, no true worship ministry nor ordinances but in her way, & this gave occasion to those that loathed her abominations to depart out of her, & it may be admonition to others lest they stumble at that stumbling stone.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

I can easily guess at your policy in placing *this Rock* last, as being in your opinion the *Greatest* of the *Three*, and so Great, that tho' I might possibly Keep off from receiving any prejudice by the *Two* former, yet I could not but Run soul upon *This*, and Ruine my Cause. But alas! poor man, you might have known (had you been pleas'd ever to Consult our Writers) that this same Rock has been long since quite Blown up, and so Levell'd as to be put out of any Capacity of Hurting the Cause I am embarked in.

I very well know, that you and your Brethren do not scruple Basely to Delude and Deceive poor Ignorant people in this matter, by telling them that the Protestants beyond Sea are most (if not all) in an exact Agreement with yourselves as to manner of Ordination, Worship, &c. But tho' you make

make no Conscience thus to Beguile and Mislead Ignorant People, who know little (if any thing) more of the Transactions of the World than what lies within the narrow Compass of *Eight or Ten miles round them*, yet you should have been more Prudent than to think to *Put upon Others* after such a manner, Who are much *Better Acquainted* with the *State of the Protestants beyond Sea* than you seem to be by your *Letter*.

'Twill I suppose be a great Surprize to your Followers to hear and have plainly proved and made out, (What is so directly Contrary to the Wrong Notions you have instilled into them, viz.) that *All the Protestants beyond Sea* do Approve of *Our Rites and Ceremonies*, and *Episcopal Ordination*, &c. as *Very Lawfull*, and do *Condemn your Separation* from our Church as *Unwarrantable*, and yet this is no Other than what shall be made Good in my intended Treatise above-mentioned.

In the mean while 'twill be abundantly sufficient to observe in general, that your Case is very far different from the Case of the *Protestant Churches beyond Sea* as to the matter of Ordination; and therefore the Denying the *Validity of your Ordination* will not presently amount to a like Flat Denial of the *Validity of their Ordination*; neither do I go about presently to *Un-church them*, tho' what I have said concerning the *Invalidity of your Ordination* is Enough to *Un-Church All the Dissenters in England*.

And hence you may learn, that the Church of England is far from *Monopolizing True Ministry and Salvation* to Her self, or from saying That there is no *True Worship* but in her Way, &c. tho' She doth maintain that *Schism* or an *Unnecessary Separation* from her Communion by such as ought so Submit to Her *Lawfull Injunctions*, is a *Damnable Sin*; and Consequently that *All the Dissenters in England* that are *Guilty of such a Separation*, are *Guilty of a Damnable Sin*; and as long as they Continue so, are *Out of a State of Salvation*. And this is such a *Monopolizing of Salvation* as the *Scripture* plainly warrants again and again; and therefore to *Blame it*, is to *Blame the Scripture it self*.

I shall only observe further, that had you consulted Mr. Benner's *Book of Schism* from ch. 6. to ch. 11. inclusively, you might have seen what you say in this last paragraph, answered afore you wrote; and that what you say concerning the Church of Rome, hath no Relation to our Church, and therefore is altogether *Impertinent*: and lastly, that I am under no Apprehension of Our Church being Pulled down, So long as Authority is Able to Keep off your Party from Laying Violent Hands upon Her. Let us then Proceed.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

Your paraleling the dissenters with the papists is most trifling, & lays you exceeding open, its very well known the dissenters are at the remotest distance from them, & they themselves say that a reconciliation with some might be, but with us impossible, this turne of yours brings to my mind what is reported of Billingsgate, where the greatest w-re shall be sure to cry w--re first, between Rome & some others it is evident many real & design'd parallels may be made in doctrine constitution discipline & worship; but all that you have raked up concerning the dissenters is only nominal & accidental; good is no less good though evil ones have counterfeited it to cover base designs, the pharisees made prayer a pretence to devour widows houses, yet is not prayer lesse a duty, & to be neglected & exploded thereupon, & so though Romane missionaries (supposing your relations to be true) have pretended to the spirit in prayer while they were destitute of the spirit. & had wicked purposes in hand, yet is not praying in the Holy Ghost to be cast away, & all turned into forme, praying extempore tooke not its rise from them, but is as old as the bible, and the learned Mr Clarkson hath sufficiently made out from Antiquity, that there were no such thing as formes made use of in the church for some centuys after Christ; its very certain that the papists have turned themselves into all shapes to divide protestants, & to blast & blemish the reformation, & many more instances might be given of their intreagues among you than us, but we object not to you such trifles, but things more weighty & real.

It

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

It had been much Better for you, Sir, had you contented your self to make use of the plain common word [Comparing] instead of that Word of *Art*, which you Falsely write [Paraleling.] For your Not Knowing how to write the Word more Agreeable to its Derivation (as appears from more than One Instance in the foregoing paragraph of your Letter) is another Shrewd Hint, that Greek is truly Greek to you, and that you are not endued with the Gift of Tongues, tho' you vainly pretend to that of Uterance, whereas they are Both joyned together in the very Text, where the Apostles are said to speak (namely, with other Tongues) as the Spirit gave them Uterance. And therefore your mentioning above that the Apostles prayed as the Spirit gave them Uterance *Act. 1. 24, 25.* and *Act. 4. 24. to 30.* is no other in effect than Two False Citations; inasmuch as there is no mention made in either of the forecited places of their Praying then, as the Spirit gave them Uterance; but you Boldly and Unwarrantably take part of a verse out of one Chapter, and heedlessly apply it to parts of two other Chapters.

Moreover you your self, Sir, do not Deny, but that the Parallel I have drawn (by way of Specimen of what might be more Largely done that way) between the *Disfemers and Papists* holds True, and therefore if it be most Trifling, it can become so only on account of the Triflingness of the Instances wherein the said Parallel is drawn. And if you think fit thus to Intimate, that *Praying and Preaching Without Book &c.* as Opposed to *Praying and Preaching Within Book*, are Matters Most Trifling to be insisted upon, I think you are much in the Right; and shall only add, that you would do well to Act accordingly, and Not to keep up a Separation on account of Such Matters as are by your own Confession Most Trifling.

Well, but it seems the aforesaid Parallel brings to your mind (What? Why, it might have been reasonably expected in consideration of Mr. Dowley's Great Gravity and

and Purity, a Text of Scripture, or at least in consideration of Mr. Dowley's Great Learning; a saying out of some Learned Author: but no such matter, Mr. Dowley's Gravity, Purity, and Learning is not so Great, but that He can upon Occasion Condescend to take up with) *What is reported at Billingsgate*. To have thus recourſe to Such a place as *Billingsgate*, is What one would not think ſtrange of among a Company of Porters, or a Crew of Fellows that have been Bred up at *Horses heels*: but it ſeems very Unbecoming Mr. Dowley, who pretends to have been Bred up at least at the ſeats of ſome (Puritan) *Gronſtied*.

But what is it that is reported of *Billingsgate*? Why, that there the *Greatest* We-re ſhall be Sure to cry *We-re* firſt. Hah! what is the matter now? What, have We got in this *First* Saying a *Pea* Word, which is not fit to be written? Why then did not Mr. Dowley's Gravity and Purity prevail upon him to let quite alone the mentioning of the ſaid Expreſſion, if it could not be mentioned without ſome offence to Modesty? But Sir, one ſo Converſant in *Scripture* as you are, Surely cannot be Ignorant, that the Word [*Whore*] frequently occurs in the *Holy Writers*, and therefore for you to be afraid, that the Writing of the aforeſaid Word in full ſhould deſile your Pen and Paper, can be look'd upon as no other than the very Height of *Prophanity*, *Squamiſhneſs*, and a *Scruple* (juſt like the *Reſ* of your *Scruples*, namely) altogether or downright *Aniſcriptural*. So much for the Original or *Riſe* of your *ſine* ſaying, and your manner of writing it: next for the *Deſign* and *Meaning* of it.

If, then you dare but ſtand to the Determination of your *Billingsgate* Proverb, I doubt not but to make it quickly appear, that your Party is the moſt Blamable. For 'tis notoriously known to All that have any tolerable insight into the History of Our Church-Transactions ſince the Reformation, that your Party at their *Fiſt* Separating from our Communion began to juſtify ſuch their Practice by Crying out againſt our Church as the *Whore* of *Babylon*; and you have ever ſince maintained and kept up your Separation by no *Aniſcript* or

Chas more than by Continuing to Cry out *Against Us as Papists*. And this is Evident from *De Laune's Book* you sent me, where are several Pages to this purpose. And therefore with what Truth can you say, that my *Paralleling the Dissenters to the Papists* is as it were *Crying whore first*, when it appears from *De Laune's Book*, that He had paralleld the Church of England to the Church of Rome above twenty years agoe, and consequently Cried (in the language of your *Fine Proverb*) *Whore First?* and therefore according to the inference you make from the said *Proverb*, you have fairly proved your Own Party to be (in the language of your *Billinggate Proverb*) the *Greatest Whore*.

I assure you, Sir, that *Mr. De Laune's Book* was the Occasion of my Drawing up that short *Parallel* (at the end of my First Letter) between you and the *Papists*. For hearing a little after I was settled here, that the said Book was mightily esteemed by your Party, I procured It long afore I had drawn up *Either of my Letters*, and finding that the Author spent a very considerable part of his Book in drawing a *Parallel between Us and the Papists*: hereupon I thought with my self, that a more likely Method to make your Party sensible of the *Weakness of this Objection* (so much insisted on by you) could not be taken, than by *Turning It upon your selves*, and by shewing that in those very Things, wherein you differ from Us, and which you Exoll as peculiar Excellencies in your way of Worship, you do after all Agree with the *Papists*. And I have not missed of my Aim herein, but have Got as much as I Desired from you in the matter. For it seems obvious and evident enough to a Common Capacity, that I have hereby Forced you to Allow What will Answer and Confute All the Objections made by your Party on this head. For say you, "Good is no less Good tho' Evil ones have counterfeited it to cover base designs. The Pharisees made Prayer a Pretence to Devout Widows Houses; yet is not Prayer less a Duty, and to be Neglected and Exploded thereupon &c. In like manner say I according to your own way of Arguing; "Good is no less Good tho' the *Papists* may make use of it: and therefore tho' the *Papists* pray by Form, yet

"is not *Praying by Form* less a *Duty*, or to be *Neglected* and
 "Exploded thereupon, and All turned into *Extempore*
 "Prayer: tho' the *Papists* kneel at prayers, particularly at
 "the *Sacraments*, use the *Cross* in *Baptism* &c. yet these *Decent*
 "Rites are not therefore to be presently *Cast away*". And
 after the like manner may the far Greatest part of *De*
Laune's Book be *Confuted* by what you your self are
 Forced to *Acknowledge* in this your Letter to be no other
 than *Truth*. And so you have pretty well quit scores with
 the said Book. For whereas the said Book (tho' sent by
 you to Me to be your *Voucher*) had the Ill manners to
 give the *Flat Ly* to what you were pleased to say at the
 beginning of your Letter, you at the end of your Letter have
 yielded a *Truth*, which will *Answer All* (or most part)
 that follows in the said Book from p. 17 to the end; and
 likewise the other adjoining Treatise stiled, the *Image of*
the Beast: and so you have took here full *Revenge* for the
Affront you met with at the Beginning from your *Voucher*,
 as should have been.

Your mentioning what is said of the *Pharisees* by our
 Saviour, viz. that they made *Prayer* a *Pretext* to *Devout*
Widows houses, gives me just occasion to pray to God,
 that He would be pleased to give you such a measure of
 his Grace as to enable you *Impartially* to *Examine* your
 Own Conscience as to this *Pharisaical Practice*; and whe-
 ther you are not *Faulty* in the same respect. To which end
 consider, that 'twas not Barely by *Praying*, but (as our Sa-
 vour assures us) by making *Long Prayers*, and so pretending
 that they were more *Gifted* than others by reason of such
Long Extempore Prayer (for I suppose you will not Allow
 they made use of *Forms* in those Early times,) that the
Pharisees were wont to *Devout Widows Houses*, that is, so
 far to *Insinuate* themselves into the Good Opinion of *Silly Wo-*
men as to Get away All they had in *Gifts* and *Present*. And
 how near this Case comes to that of you and your Followers,
 is too well known to need further Explanation.

Had your skill in matters relating to the *Papists* been as Great
 as your *Zeal* against them, you would have known, that
 Those called by you *Roman Missionaries* might with more
 accuracy

accuracy have been called *Romish Missionaries* (the more learned and Accurate Writers having thought fit to observe a Distinction between the two words, *Roman* and *Romish*, the better to Avoid Ambiguity) but this being a sort of Nicety, it is the more easily Excuseable, and therefore I shall insist no longer upon It, but proceed to Observe that what you say of the *Romish Missionaries*, may be said likewise of you and your Brethren, namely that you (as well as they) pretend to the Spirit in Prayer, while you are destitute of the Spirit. For is it not justly to be Feared, that such your Pretence is chiefly to Cover Base Designs; and is it not Known, that you likewise have wicked purposes in hand, viz. to Deceive poor Ignorant People in matters which concern their Eternal Salvation? Sir, I assure you with the Sincerity and Charity of a Christian, that my Heart even Trembles for you and your Brethren, when I consider how much your vain Pretensions to the Extraordinary Assistances of the Spirit in Prayer, &c. makes way for your Own and Others Running into the Sin against the Holy Ghost; whilst thereby you ascribe Unwarrantable Expressions and sometimes Downright Blasphemies to the Holy Spirit of God; and Encourage Every pitifull Ignorant Fellow to be so Impudent and Irreligious as Not to be Afraid to Assert Publickly, that What He Speaks or writes, is as the Spirit gives him Utterance; forasmuch as He well knows, that He hath as much to Thew for the Spirit's so Giving him Utterance, as you and your Brethren have.

You do no other than make use of the *Popish Jesuitical* Artifice of Quibbling, when you say, that Praying Extempore took not its Rise from the Papists, but it is as Old as the Bible. For tho' it be True, that Praying Extempore, when Rightly Qualified, is as Old as the Bible; yet tis as True, that Praying Extempore when Not rightly Qualified, but used as by you in Opposition to the Lawfull Commands of the Rulers of the Church &c. is not as Old as the Bible, but was First brought up amongst Us by the *Popish Priests* in order to cause Divisions; and hath been ever since kept up by the Dissenting Teachers to the same end and purpose. Sure I am that Forms of Prayer are as old as the Bible, as you may learn

learn not only from the Lord's Prayer in the New Testament, but from several Instances in the Old Testament, as Numb. 6. 23, 24, 25, 26. Deut. 10. 7, 8. &c. as may be more largely seen in *Case of Conscience Resolved concerning the Lawfulness of Joining with Forms of Prayer &c.* Part 2d. Case 5. Where also may be seen that Mr. Clarkson's Learning was not so Great, or at least His Impartiality was not so Sincere, as to Free him from maintaining a Great Falshy, by affirming that *Forms of Prayer* were not in use for some Centuries after Christ. The Contrary whereof is plainly proved in *Case 5. of the Treatise* above-mentioned, as also in Mr. Bennet's *Abridgements* from p. 55 to p. 69. and Dr. Comber's *History of Liturgies* ch. 1, 2, 3, &c.

What might be further added to shew, that the Dissenting Teachers are in reality little other than Tools made use of by the Papists to Destroy the Church of England, and so to Restore Popery, I shall have Occasion to take large Notice of in my next Treatise, and so shall Omit It here; only Observing, that you, Sir, and your Brethren seem to take Great Care to Keep your Followers in Deep Ignorance as to Any Particulars which might tend to Open their Eyes and to let them see, that the Bishops and Ministers of the Church of England are so far from (what is truly called) Popery, that they have been All along the Main Bulwarks of the Protestant Religion Against the Papists, and accordingly have been, and still are Acknowledged as such by the Protestant Churches beyond Sea; tho' you and your Brethren are not Ashamed Falsely to Misrepresent them to your Bigotted Followers as Papists. Wherefore I cannot but take this Opportunity to Acquaint your Followers, that the Chief Compilers of the Common Prayer were Burnt in the Reign of the Popish Queen Mary I. and therefore to be sure were far from being Papists, when they chose to lay down their Lives for the sake of the Protestant Religion. And again in the reign of the late Popish King James II. several Bishops of our Church were Imprisoned in the Tower, and Tryed, and Other Ministers of Note in Our Church were suspended, &c. for Opposing the Designs then on foot to Bring in Popery; whilst

the Dissenters were highly Caresed and Favoured by the said *Papish* King James II. and his Party. And surely nothing more *Weighty* or *Real* can be urged to shew, that it is by means of the Dissenters that the *Papists* hope still to Destroy one time or other the Church of England, and then to Advance Popery upon her Ruin.

I have now gone thro' All the several *Hints* you threatned me with above; and whether they have done *More Hurt* to my Cause or yours, let the Reader Determine. I shall only observe, that they seem to have been so far from making Good those Two or Three Points or Heads they were brought for, that they can by no means be Allowed as sufficient to serve for All the Rest.

The only Three Heads you have taken notice of in your Letter, are these, *viz.* Forms of Prayer, your Presbyterian Ordination, and my Specimen of a Parallel that might be Drawn between you and the *Papists*. And you have been so far from Disproving the Arguments I have made use of on each of the forementioned Heads, that as to Forms of Prayer you have Asserted *What will Justifie it against all Objections*; and as to my Paraleling you with the *Papists* you have thereby been forced to Acknowledge *What will evidently shew the Weakness of the Objections made by your Party against Us on account of our Agreement with the Papists*; and lastly, as to your Ordination you have shewn that you are so Far from Rightly Understanding the Controversy about such Presbyterian Ordination, that you do not Rightly know so much as to Spell the word [Presbyter]: To pals by many other False Spellings which are to be Found in your Letter, tho' I have not so much as taken notice of them, excepting only your [Jone], [Paraleling], and [Paralel].

How many other Heads be there mentioned in my Letters, which you have not so much as Spoken One Word about, much less Disproved them? And yet if they hold Good and Cannot be Disproved, your own Practice and that of your Followers must be allowed to be Erroneous and Sinfull. And upon these Considerations I cannot but Believe, that 'twill be thought by All Impartial judges, that there still remains

very

With Dr. Wells's Answer.

51

very Great Occasion for you to Write again, if not to Appear in Print; notwithstanding All you have been pleased to Alledge to the Contrary. Indeed would you deal so Ingenuously, as Openly to Declare (what your Letter too plainly intimates to be) the True Reason of your Forbearing as present to Appear in Print, namely, that It is because you think it by no means Proper or Convenient for you to Appear in Print, till you can Appear in True Arguing, or at least in True Spelling; this is so Reasonable an Excuse as must be Allowed by Me and All Other Persons to be Entirely Sufficient and Satisfactory. And therefore I shall also forbear to say any more on that Subject, but proceed Duely to Consider the Counsel you give me in the Close of your Letter, which is as follows.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

Sir If the counsel of one so much below you in names and titles might have any place, I would advise you to turn your thoughts from these weak and beggarly elements to the more weighty matters of religion, make the faith of christ and the love of God more your study than the advancement of ceremony, which is at best but a thing mint Annise & Cummin, I am sure it would be more pleasing to god, profitable to your People, and comfortable to your self at last, if your spirit be wholly taken up with form gesture & habit in religion, I must professe to you mine is not, I have matters of greater concern to my self and others to exercise my mind upon, and though I have digressed so far to write this privately to you, yet you must look for no more of this nature from me, it is not meet that I should leave the substance to serve ceremony, & so I bid you heartily farewell.

*your very humble servant
P. Dowley.*

*Lutterworth march 15 :
1703.*

D 2

Dr.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

Sir, I must say that your Letter is All of a piece, and that as you Begin so you End it with *Disproving your self* or *Self-Contradiction*; so that your Counsel is of no use, but to expose the *Weakness* of the Counsellor, and his great *Unfitness* for such an Office.

You do not deny but the *Requiring Obedience* to our Ceremonies is *Taking Aids, Gifts and Censures*, and This is abundantly enough to *justify the Writing* of my Letters; and your *Counselling* me as if I had not done well therein, only shews that you can give Counsell which is *directly contrary* to the Counsell of our Saviour himself. For our Saviour in the very same places you refer to (*viz. Mat. 23. 23. or Luke 11. 42.*) expressly saith, that the *Taking of Aids &c.* and therefore *Obedience to Ceremonies* (as being the same by your own confession) ought not to be left Undone. Hence may be seen, how very *Unfit* a Person you are to be a *Spiritual Guide*, since you scruple not to *Find Fault* with what our Saviour requires; and to *Counsell against Doing*, what our Saviour expressly Counsells *Not to leave Undone*; and how plainly *Blame-worthy* you and your Followers are, whilst you thus *Openly Disregard and Despise the Directions* of Christ, so far as to *Pride your selves*, and think your selves *Better or Purer Christians* than Others, only because you *Dare to leave quite Undone*, what Christ (however small the matters may be in themselves) hath commanded not to be left Undone. Hence, Sir, you may learn, that were you but so *Happy as Rightly to Know*, what is *Pleasing to God*, what is *Profitable to the People*, and what will be *Comfortable to your self* at the last; you would know, that you *Sin* even by *turning your Thoughts* from *Lawfull Ceremonies* (tho' in themselves they were no other than *weak and beggerly Elements*) so far as to have no *Regard* thereto: you would know, that, was the *Faith of Christ* and *Love of God* duely *studied* by you, you would be induced thereby to have the same *Concern* for the *Advancement* of Ceremony as I have, namely in Order to the *Decent Performance* of Religious Worship, in due Obedience to
the

the Lawfull Injunctions of our Church-Governours, and lastly and above all as a means to Restore the Primitive Peace and Unity of the Church; a matter of the very Highest Importance, as we learn from our Saviour, John 17. 21, 22, 23. and other places of Scripture: you would know, that your Spirit ought to be taken up (in the same measure as mine is) even with Form, Gesture, and Habit in Religion; and that there can be no Matters of so great Concern to your self and others, as to Excuse you in the sight of God from Exercising your Mind even upon those things which you now Mind not at all: lastly, you would know, that your Regard to Substance will not excuse your Disregard to Ceremony; and that there is no need to Leave the Former to Serve the Latter, but that Both may and ought to be duely attended upon, and are so by every True Christian.

Thus you may see, how very Ill your Counsel is even in every Particular of it, and that you sadly stand in need of Counsel your self, and of some one to be your Spiritual Guide into the Knowledge of the Truth, from which you are at present very Distant. And whereas you say, that tho' you have Digressed thus far to Write this Privately to me, yet I must look for no more of this Nature from you; 'tis not unlikely but Others may think that your Letter may indeed be very well lookt upon as one Long Digression, being very little to the purpose; and that you had consulted your own Credit much more, had you never sent to me Any thing of the Nature your Letter is of.

I shall only add, that for my part I am and ever shall be very Ready to do you Any Charitable Office in my Power, would you give me Leave. But by your Bidding me Heartily Farewell, you seem Not to care for my Company, but to be very Glad to be Rid of it: however my Charity to you will not suffer me to Part with you wholly yet, but only for some (no long) time, 'till I can get Ready what else I judge may (or at least ought to) be Serviceable and Beneficial to the Undeceiving of you and your Followers, and to the Bringing you out of the Thick Darkness of Erroneous Prejudice and Sinfull Obstinacy into the Light and Acknowledgment of the Truth.

To this Great End I shall close All with most Earnestly
Beseeching *Almighty God* for the sake of his *Beloved Son* and
our *Loving Saviour Jesus Christ*, to *Deliver You* and your
Followers and all Others in the like sad and deplorable
State, from *All false Doctrine and Schism*, from *Hardness of*
Heart and *Contempt of his Word and Commandments*.

So shall continually pray

Your most Faithfull and

Affectionate Servant in Christ,

Cotesbach, March 25th.

1706.

EDW. WELLS.

F I N I S.

TESTIMONIES

FROM

English Protestants

For the Reformed

Churches and Divines

in the Kingdom of the Netherlands
Concerning the Council of the
Church, and the Unlawfulness of
the same.

SECOND PART

OF THE

TESTIMONIES

OF THE
ENGLISH PROTESTANTS
FOR THE REFORMED
CHURCHES AND DIVINES